

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-7 and 9 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Claim Rejection 35 USC § 103

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 § 103 as being obvious over Nguyen et al. (US 2003/0038786 in view of Kishimoto et al. (US 2002/0094846). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner cites Nguyen et al. to show a hand held computer having moveable segments and also having a protective cover with a window opening connected to the PDA body for sliding relative thereto in order to expose a display panel in one position and cover the display in part in the second position. The Examiner admits the Nguyen et al. does not show the picture switching switch which is pressed in the second position to make the display panel display only pictures relevant to the cellular phone functions.

The Examiner relies on Kishimoto et al. to teach a portable information apparatus with a switching switch to display pictures only relevant to the cellular phone functions.

Applicants submit that the amended claim is not obvious over the combination of these two references. Applicants agree that Nguyen et al. shows a hand held computer with a display that is partially covered when the cover is moved to a second position. Applicants also agree that this reference does not discuss a picture switching switch. Instead, paragraph [0115] of this reference points out that a sensing device, such as a variable resistance potentiometer, may be used to detect the relative position. This signal is used to scale the size of the overall display image as described in paragraph [0122]. This reference does not provide a picture switching switch which is pressed to display only pictures only relevant to the cellular phone functions.

Kishimoto et al. includes a folding phone which displays only a portion of the display region when the telephone is folded. A detector 121 to detect if the telephone is folded or not can be a number a number of detectors or a switch of a button type. Such a switch detects when the portable telephone is folded.

Claim 1 has now been amended to further describe the arrangement of the picture switching switch. In particular, the switch is now stated to be actuated by the sliding of the protective cover. While Kishimoto et al. shows that the phone may have sensor for determining when the phone is folded and that this sensor may be a button type switch, it does not have a switch which is actuated by the sliding of the protective cover. Instead the button switch is actuated by the folding of the telephone. Thus, Kishimoto et al. does not utilize the same type of switch as the present invention. Also, Nguyen et al. shows a sensor providing a variable signal to scale the size of the display. Even if these two references are combined, they do not teach the invention as defined by claim 1. In particular, neither of the references nor their combination teach the picture switching switch which displays only pictures relevant to cellular phone functions in a second position and where the switch is actuated by the sliding of the protective cover. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over these references.

The Examiner has presented arguments as to why Nguyen et al. shows the features of claims 2, 3, 5 and 7. However, it is noted that these claims were not included in statement of the rejection. It is assumed that these claims were meant to be included and the following is based on this assumption.

Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, 5 and 7 are allowable based on their dependency from allowable claim 1. In addition, each of these claims recite other features which makes these claims additionally allowable.

Claim 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 § 103 as being obvious over Nguyen et al. and Kishimoto et al. in view of Headon (US 6,324,386). Claim 9 stands are rejected under 35 § 103

as being obvious over Nguyen et al. and Kishimoto et al. in view of Barnett (US 6,771,939). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Headon to show a mobile phone having a foldable cover with a blocker for preventing the locking hook from breaking away. Barnett has been cited to show an electric induction plate connected to the internal circuitry of the PDA body. However, even if these two references show these two features, Applicants submit they do not aid the primary and secondary references in overcoming their deficiencies noted above. In particular, none of the combinations of references show the picture switching switch actuated by the sliding cover. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are likewise allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000